UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,707	12/26/2001	DeWayne L. Hays	MET580/4-1	4190

22892	7590	06/28/2006

VINSON & ELKINS L.L.P.
1001 FANNIN STREET
2300 FIRST CITY TOWER
HOUSTON, TX 77002-6760

EXAMINER
SHECHTMAN, CHERYL MARIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 May 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>25,27-44,47 and 48</u> is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>25,27-44,47 and 48</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 December 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to Amendment filed May 2, 2006. Claims 25,

27-44, 47, and 48 are pending. Claims 25, 30, 36, 39-42, 44, 47, and 48 are amended.

Claims 1-24, 26, 45 and 46 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Referring to the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 36-44 and 46-48,

Applicant's amendment to claims 36-44, and 47-48, and cancellation of claim 46

renders the rejection moot. With reference to the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejection

of claims 25 and 27-35, Applicants arguments with respect to the enablement of private

security services were found persuasive. As such, the 35 USC 112 first paragraph

rejection of claims 25 and 27-35 is withdrawn.

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25, 27-44, 47, and 48 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 36-41, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by US Patent Number 6,449,611 issued to Frankel et al (hereafter Frankel).

Referring to claim 36, Frankel discloses a method of obtaining information related

to security services (Abstract), comprising:

- maintaining a database of information which relates to security services

    ('database for missing/stolen items and missing persons/fugitives', Abstract)

    provided for at least one client ('posting' and 'inquiring' users, Fig. 1, elements 26

    and 40; col. 6, lines 16-21; 'insurance company' client, col. 10, lines 43- 52, Fig.

    7), wherein the database is stored on a computer at a first location, that is

    capable of data communication, using the Internet ('Internet computer

    connection', see claim 1 of Frankel), with at least a second computer operating at

    a first client location ('law enforcement agency' clients, col. 11, lines 6-10;

    'posting user', Fig. 1, element 26) that is remote from the first location (see claim

    1 of Frankel), and wherein the database of information comprises security data

    entered by at least one security officer providing security services for the client at

    a second client location remote from the first client location (remote site

    interaction, see claim 1 of Frankel; col. 11, lines 6-10; Fig. 1, element 26) and at

    least a portion of the security data is entered by the at least one security officer

    located at the second client location (col. 11, lines 6-12; col. 6, lines 16-20 and

    31-35, Fig. 1, element 30), the security data corresponding with at least one

    security related event occurring at the second at least one client location

('missing/stolen assets', Fig. 7, element 514; 'missing goods', col. 6, lines 16-20),

wherein accessing the database of information comprises:

- o navigating a web browser operating on the second computer to a website that

  is in data communication with the database ('worldwide web portal site',

  Abstract; Fig. 1, element 20; col. 2, lines 65-67);

- o providing an authorization code that permits access to at least a portion of the

  database (client 'register/log in' option, Fig. 1, element 22, col. 6, lines 9-16);

- o entering a request for information relating to the security services provided at

  the second client location (Fig. 1, elements 24 and 40 , col. 6, lines 1-31); and

- o receiving, at the second computer, at least a portion of the information

  associated with the request for data (col. 4, lines 18-20; col. 7, lines 1-18; Fig.

  2, col. 7, line 19- col. 8, line 47; col. 11, lines 6-15).

Referring to claim 37, Frankel discloses that the database comprises security

data from a plurality of client locations, and entering a request for information comprises

entering a request for information related to at least one of the plurality of client

locations (Frankel, plurality of users- posting and inquiring, see Fig. 1; col. 6, line 1 –

col. 7, line 18).

Referring to claim 38, Frankel discloses that the authorization code is pre-

assigned to a subset of information stored in the database, and providing the

authorization code permits access only to the subset of information (Frankel, see Fig. 1, wherein the log-in provides users access as posting or inquiring users).

Referring to claims 39 and 40, Frankel discloses sending a request for additional security data, via the Internet, to at least one security officer providing security services at the second client location in response to the requested information received at the second computer, wherein sending the signal to the at least one security officer comprises sending a request to the at least one security officer for data related to at least one security event that occurred at the second client location (Frankel, search inquiry, Fig. 1, elements 24 and 40; col. 6, line 67- col. 7, line 18).

Referring to claim 41, Frankel discloses that the database comprises a plurality of daily activity reports submitted by the at least one security officer providing security services at the second client location, and entering a request for information comprises requesting at least a portion of the information from at least one of the plurality of daily activity reports for security services at the second client location (Frankel, col. 11, lines 6-17).

Referring to claim 43, Frankel discloses submitting and receiving security data that comprises at least one of text files, visual images, video and audio data (Frankel, visual images and audio data, col. 6, lines 41-43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

5.   Claims 25, 27, 29, 34, 35, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,449,611 issued to Frankel et al (hereafter

Frankel), and further in view of US Patent Number 6,542,075 issued to Barker et al

(hereafter Barker).

Referring to claim 25, Frankel discloses a method of providing security services

to a client (Abstract) comprising:

- providing at least one security officer ('law enforcement agency' clients, col. 11,

   lines 6-12; 'posting user', Fig. 1, element 26; col. 6, lines 16-20 and 31-35, Fig. 1,

   element 30);

- maintaining a database of information which relates to security services

   ('database for missing/stolen items and missing persons/fugitives', Abstract)

   provided for the client ('posting' and 'inquiring' users, Fig. 1, elements 26 and 40;

   col. 6, lines 16-21; 'insurance company' client, col. 10, lines 43- 52, Fig. 7),

   wherein the database is stored on a computer at a first location that is capable of

   data communication, using the Internet ('Internet computer connection', see

   claim 1 of Frankel), with at least one security officer computer installed at a client

   location ('law enforcement agency' clients, col. 11, lines 6-10; 'posting user', Fig.

   1, element 26) that is remote from the first location (see claim 1 of Frankel), and

   maintaining the database comprises:

o receiving security data from the at least one security officer computer, via the Internet ('Internet computer connection', see claim 1 of Frankel; Fig. 1, elements 20-30, col. 6, lines 1-45; col. 11, lines 6-12, Fig. 7, element 514), wherein the security data is entered into the at least one security officer computer by the security officer providing security services at the client location (col. 11, lines 6-12; col. 6, lines 16-20 and 31-35, Fig. 1, element 30), and the security data corresponds with at least one security related event occurring at the client location ('missing/stolen assets', Fig. 7, element 514; 'missing goods', col. 6, lines 16-20);

o updating the database with at least a portion of the security data received from the security officer computer (col. 11, lines 6-12; col. 6, lines 45-67, Fig. 1, elements 34, 36, and 50; col. 9, lines 6-9); and

o hosting the database so that at least a portion of the information stored therein is Internet accessible by the client ('worldwide web portal site', Abstract; Fig. 1, element 20; col. 2, lines 65-67), wherein the client accesses the information in the database by providing an authorization code to a website that permits restricted access to at least a subset of the information stored in the database (client 'register/log in' option, Fig. 1, element 22, col. 6, lines 9-16).

However, while Frankel teaches all of the above claimed subject matter, it remains silent as to providing *private* security services at the client location for the client.

However, Barker teaches analogous art that includes providing configurable security monitoring for a premises via authorized users that are on the premises such as on-site security guards, premise owners, security directors or administrators (Abstract; Summary; col. 8, lines 11-44, Fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Frankel providing *private* security services at the client location for the client, as taught by Barker.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Frankel per the above for the purpose of specifying rules to define a level of remote monitoring of a locally detected event for a defined monitoring target, such as a premises (Barker, Abstract; Field of Invention).

Referring to claim 44, the limitations of the claim are similar to the limitations of claim 25 above and also includes a plurality of security officer computers each of which is located at a corresponding one of a plurality of client locations, each of which is remote from a first location (Frankel, 'law enforcement agency' clients, col. 11, lines 6-12; see claim 1 of Frankel; Barker, Fig. 2, element 90, col. 8, lines 31-44). Claim 44 is therefore rejected for the same reasons as claim 25.

Referring to claim 27, the combination of Frankel/Barker discloses that receiving security data from the at lease one security officer computer comprises receiving security data from a plurality of client locations, each remote from the first location, wherein each client location comprises at least one security officer computer (Frankel, 'posting' and 'inquiring' users are remote from the database, see claim 1 of Frankel; clients remote to the database log into the database over the Internet, col. 6, lines 1-50; law enforcement agencies (posting clients) post reports, col. 11, lines 1-11).

Referring to claim 29, the combination of Frankel/Barker discloses receiving an email message comprising the security data (Frankel, col. 10, lines 59-66).

Referring to claim 34, the combination of Frankel/Barker discloses submitting and receiving security data that comprises at least one of text files, visual images, video and audio data (Frankel, visual images and audio data, col. 6, lines 41-43).

Referring to claim 35, the combination of Frankel/Barker discloses sending a signal, via the Internet, to the at least one security officer computer in response to the security data entered by the at least one security officer (Frankel, col. 8, lines 48-57; col. 9, lines 18-29).

6.   Claims 28 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Frankel, in view of Barker, as applied to claims 25 and 44 above, and further in

view of US Patent Number 6,173,284 B1 issued to Brown.

        Referring to claims 28 and 47., the combination of Frankel/Barker discloses all of

the above claimed subject matter and also discloses receiving the security data

formatted as a police report, wherein the form of the standardized police report is

accessible be the at least one security office via the Internet as a website that

comprises predetermined data fields for entering the security data (Frankel, col. 11,

lines 6-10; stolen asset information fields, col. 10, line 43 – col. 11, line 18; see Fig. 2,

elements 28 and 30 for posting fields for missing goods, col. 6, lines 1-45).

        However, while the combination of Frankel/Barker discloses all of the above

subject matter, and teaches a police report (Frankel, col. 11, lines 6-10), it fails to

disclose a standardized daily activity report.

        However, Brown teaches using a standardized daily activity report ('daily'

frequency term from dropdown menu (Fig. 4, element 78).

        It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify the combination of Frankel/Barker to include a

standardized daily activity report, as taught by Brown.

        The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the

combination of Frankel/Barker per the above for the purpose of allowing a police officer

to submit a search request in order to receive a report at a daily frequency term, thereby

advantageously freeing the police officer from repetitively conducting the same

searches time and time again and allows for real time search capabilities on an ongoing

basis after the search request has been submitted once by the police officer (Brown,

col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 14).

7.   Claims 30-32 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Frankel, in view of Barker, as applied to claims 25 and 44 above, and further in

view of US Patent Number 4,847,791 issued to Martin et al (hereafter Martin).

        Referring to claims 30 and 48, the combination of Frankel/Barker discloses all of

the above claimed subject matter and also discloses 'law enforcement agency' (security

officer) clients and entering data into a website accessible via the Internet (Frankel, col.

11, lines 6-10), it remains silent as to receiving clock-in data from at least one user that

corresponds to a beginning of a work shift, receiving clock-out data from the at least one

user that corresponds to an end of the work shift, wherein the user enters the clock-in

data and the clock-out data into a website accessible via the Internet, and updating the

database with the clock-in data and the clock-out data, wherein the clock-in data and

the clock-out data is representative of a duration of the work shift.

        However, Martin teaches receiving clock-in and clock-out data from at least one

user that corresponds to a beginning and end of a work shift, wherein the user enters

the clock-in data and the clock-out data (see claims 14-16 of Martin; Abstract; Fig. 3 and

4), and updating a database with the clock-in data and the clock-out data (Fig. 6a,

element 136), wherein the clock-in data and the clock-out data is representative of a

duration of the work shift (see claims 14-16 of Martin).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify the combination of Frankel/Barker to include receiving

clock-in and clock-out data from at least one user that corresponds to a beginning and

end of a work shift, wherein the user enters the clock-in data and the clock-out data,

and updating a database with the clock-in data and the clock-out data, wherein the

clock-in data and the clock-out data is representative of a duration of the work shift, as

taught by Martin.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the

combination of Frankel/Barker per the above for the purpose of enabling the use of a

time-keeping system wherein employees' job hours, time spent on each job,

accumulated job hours, and percentages of completions of jobs can be calculated

(Martin, Abstract).

Referring to claim 31, the combination of Frankel/Barker/Martin discloses that the

at least one security officer provides at least a portion of the clock-in data by logging in

to the website (Martin, Fig, 6a, elements 100, 130, and 134; Frankel, Fig. 1, elements

20 and 22), the clock-in data comprising an identifier unique to each security officer

(Martin, 'numerical employee number', Fig. 6a, element 104), and the at least one

security officer provides at least a portion of the clock-out data by logging out of the

website (Martin, Fig. 6a, elements 132 and 134).

Referring to claim 32, the combination of Frankel/Barker/Martin discloses

tracking which client location the at least one security officer is providing security

services using data entered into the website by the security officer (Frankel, Fig. 1,

element 50, col. 7, lines 5-15).

8.   Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel,

as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Martin.

Referring to claim 42, Frankel discloses all of the above claimed subject matter

and also discloses that the database comprises data received from the at least one

security officer providing security services at the second client location (Frankel, 'police

report entered by law enforcement agency clients', col. 11, lines 6-12).

However, while Frankel teaches all of the above, it remains silent as to a

database comprising clock-in and clock-out data received by a user, the clock-in and

clock-out data representative of a duration of a work shift of the user, and entering a

request for information comprising requesting at least a portion of the clock-in data and

the clock-out data received from the user.

However, Martin teach analogous art that includes a database comprising clock-

in and clock-out data received by a user, the clock-in and clock-out data representative

of a duration of a work shift of the user, and entering a request for information

comprising requesting at least a portion of the clock-in data and the clock-out data

received from the user (see claims 14-16 of Martin; Abstract; Fig. 3 and 4; Fig. 6a,

element 136).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify Frankel to include a database comprising clock-in and

clock-out data received by a user, the clock-in and clock-out data representative of a

duration of a work shift of the user, and entering a request for information comprising

requesting at least a portion of the clock-in data and the clock-out data received from

the user, as taught by Martin.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Frankel per the

above for the purpose of enabling the use of a time-keeping system wherein employees'

job hours, time spent on each job, accumulated job hours, and percentages of

completions of jobs can be calculated (Martin, Abstract).

9.   Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frankel,

in view of Barker, in view of Martin, as applied to claim 30 above, in view of Brown, and

further in view of US Publication Number 2003/0115023 by Nickerson et al (hereafter

Nickerson).

Referring to claim 33, the combination of Frankel/Barker/Martin discloses all of

the above claimed subject matter and also discloses receiving the security data

formatted as a report, wherein a form of the report is accessible by the at least one

security officer via the Internet as a website that comprises at least one data field for

entering the security data (Frankel, col. 11, lines 6-10; stolen asset information fields,

col. 10, line 43 – col. 11, line 18; see Fig. 2, elements 28 and 30 for posting fields for

missing goods, col. 6, lines 1-45) and receiving the log-out data (Martin, see claims 14-

16; Fig. 6a, elements 132 and 134).

However, while the combination of Frankel/Barker/Martin teaches the above

claimed subject matter, it remains silent as to disclose a daily activity report, and

configuring a website not to accept log-out data from a user until the daily activity report

is submitted.

However, Brown teaches using a daily activity report ('daily' frequency term from

dropdown menu (Fig. 4, element 78).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify the combination of Frankel/Barker/Martin to include a

daily activity report, as taught by Brown.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the

combination of Frankel/Barker/Martin per the above for the purpose of allowing a police

officer to submit a search request in order to receive a report at a daily frequency term,

thereby advantageously freeing the police officer from repetitively conducting the same

searches time and time again and allows for real time search capabilities on an ongoing

basis after the search request has been submitted once by the police officer (Brown,

col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 14).

Still referring to claim 33, while the combination of Frankel/Barker/Martin/Brown

teaches all of the above claimed subject matter, it remains silent as to configuring a

website not to accept log-out data from a user until a report is submitted.

However Nickerson teaches analogous art that includes configuring a website

not to accept log-out data from a user until a report is submitted (Abstract; para. 6; see

claims 1 and 14 of Nickerson).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify the combination of Frankel/Barker/Martin/Brown to

include configuring a website not to accept log-out data from a user until a report is

submitted, as taught by Nickerson.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the

combination of Frankel/Barker/Martin/Brown per the above for the purpose of allowing

the owner of a website to access the submitted reports concerning a particular website

(Nickerson, Abstract, para. 7).

Conclusion

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M Shechtman who can be reached on (571) 272-4018. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CMS
June 20, 2006

UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER